

# FY2015 Charlotte Housing Authority Moving Forward Annual Report



The Charlotte Housing Authority's mission is to develop, operate, and provide quality housing in sustainable communities of choice for residents of diverse incomes. The agency's local name for the federal Demonstration Program Moving To Work is "Moving Forward", symbolizing the forward movement in creating community, empowering families and building partnerships that break the cycle of generational poverty and promote affordable housing as a community issue, not just a CHA issue.

***Photo:** Charlottetown Terrace is a 161 unit high rise apartment complex for disabled households. The apartment complex was built in 1977 and underwent major internal and external renovations in 2012. Charlottetown is within walking distance of a community park, commercial business offices, retail and transit.*

Charlotte Housing Authority  
400 East Boulevard  
Charlotte, NC 28203  
A. Fulton Meachem, Jr.  
CEO/President  
Submission: June 30, 2015

Introduction .....	4
Overview of Charlotte Housing Authority’s short-term and long-term Moving To Work goals and objectives. ....	4
General Housing Authority Operating Information.....	9
Proposed MTW Activities: HUD Approval Requested .....	21
Approved MTW Activities: HUD Approval Previously Granted .....	22
NOT YET IMPLEMENTED ACTIVITIES .....	58
ACTIVITIES ON HOLD.....	58
CLOSED OUT ACTIVITIES .....	59
Sources and Uses of MTW Funds.....	60
Administrative.....	64
Appendices Listing.....	66
Appendix A   Certification Statement	
Appendix B   Listing of Developments with Public Housing and Project-Based Units	
Appendix C   Rent Reform Impact Analysis for Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher Programs	
Appendix D   Community Based Rental Assistance Policy	
Appendix E   Hardship Policy	
Appendix F   Work Requirement Policy	
Appendix G   Rent Reform Overview	
Appendix H   Sample Bedroom Rent Bands	
Appendix I   Community Service Policy	
Appendix J   Violence Against Women Act	
Appendix K   Other Agency Activity	
Appendix L   Ongoing Initiatives Summary	
Appendix M   Homeownership Program Hardship Policy	
Appendix N   Statement of Family Obligations for Homeownership Program	

# CHARLOTTE HOUSING AUTHORITY

## Board of Commissioners

Commissioner Geraldine Sumter, *Chair*

Commissioner Sheila Jones, *Vice Chair*

Commissioner Dimple Ajmera

Commissioner Lucy Brown

Commissioner Nancy Crown

Commissioner Shirley L. Fulton

Commissioner William Scurry

## Executive Leadership

A. Fulton Meachem, Jr., Chief Executive Officer

Troy A. Drawz, Chief Development Officer

Shaunté Evans, Chief Administrative Officer

Heather Franklin, Chief Financial Officer

Harriet Huell, Chief Counsel

Larry Padilla, Chief Operating Officer



# Introduction

## Overview of Charlotte Housing Authority's short-term and long-term Moving To Work goals and objectives.

In a country with over 3,000 housing authorities, Charlotte Housing Authority is proud to be one of only 39 housing agencies participating in the federal demonstration program, Moving To Work (MTW). The MTW program is a unique opportunity for agencies to serve their communities housing needs using activities and policies that are best suited for their local community. The federal government permits MTW agencies to operate in a less restrictive regulatory environment and combine federal funds allocated for Public Housing, Housing Choice Voucher, and Capital Funds into one pool, Block Grant Funds. The purpose of the MTW program is to:

- 1) Reduce cost and achieve greater cost savings in federal expenditures
- 2) Expand housing choices for low-income families
- 3) Give incentives to families with children pursuing self-sufficiency activities

This document serves as the agency's FY2015 Moving Forward Annual Report and provides clientele, stakeholders and HUD with a review of what the Charlotte Housing Authority has accomplished between April 1, 2014 - March 31, 2015. CHA must note that this is the last Annual Report in this fiscal year format. Beginning April 1, 2015, the agency transitioned to a calendar year, January - December. The next annual report will be released in March 2016 and cover the first 9 months of our FY2016. Afterwards, an Annual Report will be released March 2017 for the remaining 12 months of FY2016, January 2016 - December 2016.

During our FY2015 (April 1, 2014 - March 31, 2015), CHA was approved to implement three new activities 1) Streamline Project Based Voucher and Public Housing regulations; 2) Biennial Inspections of Housing Choice Voucher units; and 3) Implement a Public Housing No Assistance Termination Policy and continued ongoing MTW activities (for a full list, see Appendix L Ongoing Initiatives Summary). CHA has three additional activities pending HUD approval for implementation during FY2016: 1) Housing Choice Voucher Homeownership Program; 2) Triennial Reexamination for Elderly and/or Disabled Only Households; and 3) Biennial Reexamination for Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) Participants (now merged with the agency wide Biennial Reexamination activity).

Moving To Work is a necessary platform that allows CHA to implement activities that positively impact:

- The employment rate for able-bodied heads of households and other family members;
- The number of family members in training and/or education programs;
- The increase in average and median income of families (all sources and earned income) (excluding seniors and disabled families);
- The amount of funds leveraged in the community for production of affordable housing and the provision of supportive services;
- The number of children who enter post-secondary education;

- The percent increase in the number of CHA students that enter the Charlotte Housing Authority Scholarship Fund (CHASF);
- The number of housing units in mixed-income environments; and
- The distribution of housing units and housing opportunities for (a) Section 9 and (b) Project-Based Section 8

## Short Term

In November 2014, CHA received a commissioned report from IMPLAN Group, LLC on the “Economic Impacts of the Charlotte Housing Authority” for the years 2009 – 2014. In summary, the report found CHA to be a significant contributor to the Mecklenburg County economy. Some of the direct impacts are 1) the number of employees the agency hires (offering competitive salary and benefits); 2) housing assistance payments made to private landlords through the Housing Choice Voucher program; 3) the development of mixed-income residential properties; and 4) the rehabilitation of existing properties. The last two create affordable housing and jobs in the construction, maintenance and repair and security industries. Finally, the purchases of goods and services, utility payments, along with taxes for various aspects of the business are counted towards the financial impact on the local economy. Indirectly, the dollars spent in the community by employees and residents can be factored into the economy impact.

CHA’s short term plan is to build upon these contributions by continuing to impact neighborhood stabilization, which will also increase tax revenues in Mecklenburg County. Short term examples with goals to revitalize units in our communities, provide innovative property management, enhance the self-sufficiency of residents, and provide housing for the most vulnerable in our population include the following activities:

1. In December of 2013 CHA submitted its plan to HUD for the Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) conversion of 3,279 public housing dwelling units to the Project Based Voucher (PBV) platform in three phases. CHA was offered a Conditional Housing Assistance Payment (CHAP) contract on March 26, 2015. Our next step is to submit our financing plans for approval. We will do this in three phases, with Phases I & II scheduled for completion by December of 2016. The Phase III completion date has yet to be determined, but will be beyond 2016.
2. During the time period of April 2014 - March 2015, the Center for Employment Services (CES) has placed 133 CHA residents in jobs. In FY14-15, CES continued to extend services to communities along Charlotte’s West Boulevard corridor. The agencies at the CES perform outreach and recruitment at all CHA properties; however, the emphasis continues to be communities that do not receive structured supportive services.

The following are the current measurements that are tracked by CES:

- Percentage of CHA residents who utilize CES structured programs: The performance metrics for this area was to have a 4% increase or more, with a target goal of a 50% participation rate. There was improvement in this area; however, a 44% participation rate (116 of 262 participants) was achieved. CHA will continue to work with resident organizations and case management staff to increase this number.



- Percentage of CHA residents who utilize CES and gain employment: A target goal of 50% job placement for CHA residents was established for this year. The center was able to achieve a 45% job placement rate (133 of 293). Efforts to assist residents in becoming more marketable in occupations in demand will continue, with increased numbers of skills training engagement with local skills providers.
- Number of residents that become job ready through CES services. The target goal for this area was 50. The program was able to exceed this goal with 59 residents successfully completing job readiness training programs at CES.

Through the center's four (4) service providers, CES will continue to provide job training, job placement and GED training. Efforts to increase the activity level of CHA residents will remain a priority going into the next program year.

3. Eighteen Dillehay Courts residents graduated from the 'Just Getting' By World class in December of 2014. They started their 16-session journey with 21 people. Three left the class early because they found full-time employment. Of these amazing 18, six now have jobs, eight are enrolled in adult high school or are in GED programs and 4 are enrolled in a CNA training class. All 18 are better advocates for their children and eight are working with Legal Aid on expungement of a prior conviction. This life-changing class will be offered to other public housing residents in 2015.



4. In October 2014, CHA was the recipient of \$249,412 in budget authority for a 12-month term to support 40 additional Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) vouchers. These vouchers are administered in partnership with the Salisbury VA Medical Center and serves chronically homeless veterans in the Charlotte area.
5. On April 2, 2015, HUD Secretary Julián Castro held a press conference in Charlotte to announce that Charlotte will receive over \$2.24 million in Jobs-Plus funding. Overall HUD awarded \$24 million to housing authorities in nine states to help low-income public housing residents secure higher paying jobs through the Jobs-Plus Pilot Program. The program model will target CHA's Southside Homes Community. The entire development will be eligible for services to assist with employment, education and training.



### **Long Term -**

CHA's long term plan includes developing mixed-income housing and mixed-use developments utilizing vacant parcels currently owned by CHA as well as site acquisitions. There is discussion of (re)developments that will include affordable housing and retail space. CHA works within a framework to create housing for those at the poverty level, workforce housing, and housing for seniors and disabled to maintain their independence. But most importantly, the agency recognizes that these housing developments can exist as part of a vibrant community that provides transportation, retail, grocery, and access to healthcare, in an area where it is essential to the families residing in the housing.

CHA has begun a tradition of self-development from the initial concept to land acquisition, design, approval, construction and lease-up, as well as self-managing our tax-credit developments with Mill Pond, Charlottetown renovation, and the Parktowne/Strawn bond transaction. Current projects include both The Vistas @ 707 and Park and Marsh. Additional partnerships are being explored and/or established with local city government, developers, banks, private lenders, housing finance agencies and HUD to expand this strategy. The self-development, self-management and mixed-use development are part of the agency's long-term sustainability plan.

The Charlotte Housing Authority (CHA) operates three legally separate, locally incorporated entities to help further its mission of providing safe, decent and affordable housing. Affordable housing property means real property, the principal component of which is comprised of rental housing that is affordable to households that earn less than 80% of the Area Median Income (AMI).

- **Horizon Acquisition Corporation** - Horizon Acquisition is a for profit subsidiary that was organized in March 2001. Horizon Development Properties has 100% stock ownership. The mission of this organization is to acquire, construct, develop, operate and/ or hold title to affordable housing property, interests in property, and interests in entities that own and operate affordable housing property.
- **Horizon Development Properties, Inc.-** Horizon Development Properties, Inc. is a non-profit, tax exempt 501 (c)(3) subsidiary that was organized in March 2001. The mission of the organization is to provide affordable housing to all qualified families.
- **CORE Programs, Inc. -** CORE Programs, Inc. is a non-profit, tax exempt 501 (c)(3) subsidiary. The entity was formerly named Gateway Supportive Services, Inc. and was organized in December 2001. The mission of the organization is to assist affordable (low income) housing residents in achieving economic independence through educational and other support services.

Developments in process include:

- The Tall Oaks Demolition Plan was submitted to the Special Applications Center at HUD May 2015. The rezoning for the site has been approved by City Council. After HUD's approval for demolition, next steps are to secure a low income housing tax credit allocation and resident relocation. The tax credit application has been submitted.

- Park and Marsh vacant land will be used for the construction of 92 one bedroom Project-Based Section 8 units in a mid rise apartment complex for seniors. Tax Credits and local Housing Trust Fund dollars have been awarded for this development and construction is slated to begin in the fall of 2015.
- CHA is finalizing a strategy to redevelop the entire 2.2 acre Hall House site into a thriving mixed-use development comprised of residential and commercial space that offers the highest and best opportunity for long-term sustainability.
- The Charlotte Housing Authority has identified the Strawn site located at 1301 South Boulevard, Charlotte, NC 28203 as a candidate for demolition and disposition. This 16.2 acre property contains CHA's former administrative offices, an activity center and 122 residential cottages that have been identified as obsolete and is underutilized. The Strawn Master Plan proposes to replace the existing affordable housing units in a mixed-use and mixed-income community on the same site. The City Council has rezoned this site and CHA recently received authorization from the Special Applications Center at HUD to demolish the 122 residential cottages, activity center and administrative office.
- The Charlottetown Terrace parcel consists of a 12- story apartment building currently occupied by Section 9 (Public Housing) handicapped and disabled residents. Situated on 5.54 +/- acres, CHA intends to create two (2) outparcels to redevelop as part of the CHA's 5-Year Strategic Plan. The intended use will be a mixed-income and mixed-use development.
- The Parktowne Outparcel is 1.6 +/- acres of vacant land adjacent to a six-story senior apartment complex that houses Section 9 residents. The outparcel is zoned for mixed-use development.
- Continue Bond issuance for multifamily housing revenue bonds in the City of Charlotte.

MTW flexibility is needed in order for CHA to carry out its short and long term strategic plans because the Demonstration program allows considerable flexibility in how Federal funds are able to be utilized and permits exemption from many existing Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher program rules found in the United States Housing Act of 1937.



## General Housing Authority Operating Information

The following tables are required by HUD to describe the housing stock at the Charlotte Housing Authority.

Annual MTW Report				
II.4.Report.HousingStock				
A. MTW Report: Housing Stock Information				
New Housing Choice Vouchers that were Project-Based During the Fiscal Year				
Property Name	Anticipated Number of New Vouchers to be Project-Based *	Actual Number of New Vouchers that were Project-Based	Description of Project	
Weyland II	0	15	Coordinated effort of the City of Charlotte, Mecklenburg County and CHA to provide funds for rental assistance, supportive services and housing development for substance abuse victims who are homeless.	
The Residence at Renaissance	23	8	HOPE VI Revitalization family development	
Affordable Supportive Housing (McCreesh Scattered Site)	50	15	Coordinated effort of the City of Charlotte, Mecklenburg County and CHA to provide funds for rental assistance, supportive services and housing development for supportive housing for men with severe disabilities who are homeless or at risk of becoming homeless	

		Anticipated Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Committed at the End of the Fiscal Year *	Anticipated Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Leased Up or Issued to a Potential Tenant at the End of the Fiscal Year *
Anticipated Total Number of New Vouchers to be Project-Based *	Actual Total Number of New Vouchers that were Project-Based	767	675
253	38	Actual Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Committed at the End of the Fiscal Year	Actual Total Number of Project-Based Vouchers Leased Up or Issued to a Potential Tenant at the End of the Fiscal Year
		571	536

\* From the Plan

### Other Changes to the Housing Stock that Occurred During the Fiscal Year

Hall House 191 units are offline and HUD approval for disposition has been placed on hold due to Rental Assistance Demonstration Program (RAD).

Strawn Cottages 45 units are vacant and offline and we recently received approval to demolish all 122 residential units.

There were 54 units offline undergoing Modernization. The details are as follows: NC003000062 Claremont 12 units, NC003000025 Meadow Oaks 14 units, NC003000020 Savanna 16 units and NC003000062 Victoria Square 12 units

Edwin Towers 175 units came back online after modernization completed.

Examples of the types of other changes can include but are not limited to units that are held off-line due to the relocation of residents, units that are off-line due to substantial rehabilitation and potential plans for acquiring units.

## General Description of Actual Capital Fund Expenditures During the Plan Year

The following renovations were performed: Autumn Place (reroofing & gutter replacement, replace HVAC units, refrigerators, landscaping/ tree trimming), Charlottetown (landscaping/tree trimming), Edwin Towers (additional renovation work, landscaping/tree trimming), Leafcrest (landscaping/tree trimming, replace siding with Hardie), Meadow Oaks (replace flooring, exterior entry doors, remove and replace interior solid core wood doors, landscaping/tree trimming), Parktowne out parcel (landscaping/tree trimming), Southside (parking/driveway/sidewalk repair, kitchen appliances (range, refrigerator, range hood, landscaping/tree trimming), Strawn out-parcel (landscaping/tree trimming), and Wallace Woods (landscape/grading/sidewalk{retention pond}).

## Overview of Other Housing Owned and/or Managed by the PHA at Fiscal Year End

Housing Program *	Total Units	Overview of the Program
Tax-Credit	1,819	Developments with tax credit and public housing (owned by CHA's subsidiaries Horizon Development Properties Inc. and Horizon Acquisition Corp., managed by CHA and third party management companies)
State Funded	240	Multi-family Project-Based Section 8 property managed by third party (CHA has a General Partnership ownership interest)
Market-Rate	338	Affordable rental units with no rental subsidy (owned by CHA's subsidiaries Horizon Development Properties Inc. and Horizon Development Acquisitions, managed by CHA and third party management companies)
<b>Total Other Housing Owned and/or Managed</b>	<b>2,397</b>	

\* **Select Housing Program from:** Tax-Credit, State Funded, Locally Funded, Market-Rate, Non-MTW HUD Funded, Managing Developments for other non-MTW Public Housing Authorities, or Other.

If Other, please describe:

N/A

## II.5.Report.Leasing

### B. MTW Report: Leasing Information

#### Actual Number of Households Served at the End of the Fiscal Year

Housing Program:	Number of Households Served*	
	Planned	Actual
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Property-Based Assistance Programs **	844	566
Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based Assistance Programs **	50	49
Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed)	1,124	1,402
<b>Total Projected and Actual Households Served</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2017</b>

\* Calculated by dividing the planned/actual number of unit months occupied/leased by 12.

\*\* In instances when a Local, Non-Traditional program provides a certain subsidy level but does not specify a number of units/Households Served, the PHA should estimate the number of Households served.

**Housing Program:****Unit Months  
Occupied/Leased\*\*\*\*****Planned                      Actual**

Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through  
Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Property-Based  
Assistance Programs \*\*\*

**10,128****6,792**

Number of Units that were Occupied/Leased through  
Local Non-Traditional MTW Funded Tenant-Based  
Assistance Programs \*\*\*

**600****588**

Port-In Vouchers (not absorbed)

**13,488****16,824**

**Total Projected and Annual Unit Months  
Occupied/Leased**

**24,216****24,204**

**Explanation for differences between planned and actual households served: CHA processed 278 port ins between April 1, 2014 – March 31, 2015. This is more than 10% of the number in FY2014. Also, adjustments were made in actual for the count of local non-traditional units being counted (MTW funding at property, but units are not Section 8 or 9)**

\*\*\* In instances when a local, non-traditional program provides a certain subsidy level but does not specify a number of units/Households Served, the PHA should estimate the number of households served.

\*\*\*\* Unit Months Occupied/Leased is the total number of months the housing PHA has occupied/leased units, according to unit category during the year.

**Average  
Number of  
Households  
Served Per  
Month****Total  
Number of  
Households  
Served  
During the  
Year**

Households Served through Local Non-Traditional  
Services Only

**51****614**



## Reporting Compliance with Statutory MTW Requirements: 75% of Families Assisted are Very Low-Income

HUD will verify compliance with the statutory objective of “assuring that at least 75 percent of the families assisted by the Agency are very low-income families” is being achieved by examining public housing and Housing Choice Voucher family characteristics as submitted into the PIC or its successor system utilizing current resident data at the end of the agency's fiscal year. The PHA will provide information on local, non-traditional families provided with housing assistance at the end of the PHA fiscal year, not reported in PIC or its successor system, in the following format:

<b>Fiscal Year:</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>
Total Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households Assisted	N/A	N/A	N/A	276	284	N/A	N/A	N/A
Number of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% of Area Median Income	N/A	N/A	N/A	258	284	N/A	N/A	N/A
Percentage of Local, Non-Traditional MTW Households with Incomes Below 50% of Area Median Income	N/A	N/A	N/A	93%	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A

## Reporting Compliance with Statutory MTW Requirements: Maintain Comparable Mix

In order to demonstrate that the statutory objective of “maintaining a comparable mix of families (by family size) are served, as would have been provided had the amounts not been used under the demonstration” is being achieved, the PHA will provide information in the following formats:

### Baseline for the Mix of Family Sizes Served

Family Size:	Occupied Number of Public Housing units by Household Size when PHA Entered MTW	Utilized Number of Section 8 Vouchers by Household Size when PHA Entered MTW	Non-MTW Adjustments to the Distribution of Household Sizes *	Baseline Number of Household Sizes to be Maintained	Baseline Percentages of Family Sizes to be Maintained
1 Person	1,209	1,029	0	2,238	34%
2 Person	405	939	0	1,344	20%
3 Person	311	1,006	0	1,317	20%
4 Person	241	764	0	1,005	15%
5 Person	107	371	0	478	7%
6+ Person	62	232	0	294	4%
Totals	2,335	4,341	0	6,676	100%

Explanation for  
Baseline  
Adjustments to  
the Distribution  
of Household  
Sizes Utilized

N/A

### Mix of Family Sizes Served

	1 Person	2 Person	3 Person	4 Person	5 Person	6+ Person	Totals
Baseline Percentages of Household Sizes to be Maintained **	34%	20%	20%	15%	7%	4%	100%
Number of Households Served by Family Size this Fiscal Year ***	2,443	1,122	991	702	321	223	5,802
Percentages of Households Served by Household Size this Fiscal Year ****	42%	19%	17%	12%	6%	4%	100%
Percentage Change	24%	-5%	-15%	-0.2%	-0.14%	0	0

Justification and Explanation for Family Size Variations of Over 5% from the Baseline Percentages

There has been a decrease in overall unit count since baseline due to the removal of Boulevard Homes and Hall House and units for Modernization from inventory during that time. Edwin Towers was brought back online this fiscal year increasing 1 bedroom units from last year. Also, CHA neglected to include PBV units in the count last year (first time using the new Attachment B) because MTW activities were not used on the PBV vouchers, however, those vouchers are part of our base voucher count.

\* “Non-MTW adjustments to the distribution of family sizes” are defined as factors that are outside the control of the PHA. Acceptable “non-MTW adjustments” include, but are not limited to, demographic changes in the community’s population. If the PHA includes non-MTW adjustments, HUD expects the explanations of the factors to be thorough and to include information substantiating the numbers used.

\*\* The numbers in this row will be the same numbers in the chart above listed under the column “Baseline percentages of family sizes to be maintained.”

\*\*\* The methodology used to obtain these figures will be the same methodology used to determine the “Occupied number of Public Housing units by family size when PHA entered MTW” and “Utilized number of Section 8 Vouchers by family size when PHA entered MTW” in the table immediately above.

\*\*\*\* The “Percentages of families served by family size this fiscal year” will reflect adjustments to the mix of families served that are directly due to decisions the PHA has made. HUD expects that in the course of the demonstration, PHAs will make decisions that may alter the number of families served.

**Description of any Issues Related to Leasing of Public Housing, Housing Choice Vouchers or Local, Non-Traditional Units and Solutions at Fiscal Year End**

Housing Program	Description of Leasing Issues and Solutions
Public Housing	No leasing challenges (units are being held for renovation/relocation)
N/A	N/A
N/A	N/A

## Number of Households Transitioned To Self-Sufficiency by Fiscal Year End

Activity Name/#	Number of Households Transitioned *	Agency Definition of Self Sufficiency
Moving Forward Supportive Services	12	Moved to homeownership or private rental not requiring a housing subsidy
N/A	0	N/A
N/A	0	N/A
N/A	0	N/A

Households Duplicated Across Activities/Definitions	N/A
---	-----

ANNUAL TOTAL NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS TRANSITIONED TO SELF SUFFICIENCY	12
--	----

\* The number provided here should match the outcome reported where metric SS #8 is used.



## II.6.Report.Leasing

### C. MTW Report: Wait List Information

#### Wait List Information at Fiscal Year End

Housing Program(s) *	Wait List Type **	Number of Households on Wait List	Wait List Open, Partially Open or Closed ***	Was the Wait List Opened During the Fiscal Year
Federal MTW and non-MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program (CHA does not maintain separate list)	Community-Wide	31,668	Closed	Yes (one week)
Federal MTW Public Housing Units	Site Based	2,662	Closed	Yes (In May 2014 the wait list re-opened for 0, 1, 3, 4 & 5 bedrooms, as available, at 8 developments.)
Project-Based Voucher	Site Based	152	Open	Yes
Federal MTW Public Housing Units at Third Party Managed Sites	Site Based	4,046	Open	Yes

More can be added if needed.

\* *Select Housing Program:* Federal MTW Public Housing Units; Federal MTW Housing Choice Voucher Program; Federal non-MTW Housing Choice Voucher Units; Tenant-Based Local, Non-Traditional MTW Housing Assistance Program; Project-Based Local, Non-Traditional MTW Housing Assistance Program; and Combined Tenant-Based and Project-Based Local, Non-Traditional MTW Housing Assistance Program.

**\*\* Select Wait List Types:** Community-Wide, Site-Based, Merged (Combined Public Housing or Voucher Wait List), Program Specific (Limited by HUD or Local PHA Rules to Certain Categories of Households which are Described in the Rules for Program Participation), None (If the Program is a New Wait List, Not an Existing Wait List), or Other (Please Provide a Brief Description of this Wait List Type).

**\*\*\* For Partially Open Wait Lists,** provide a description of the populations for which the waiting list is open.

N/A
N/A
N/A

If Local, Non-Traditional Program, please describe:

N/A
N/A
N/A

If Other Wait List Type, please describe:

N/A
N/A
N/A

If there are any changes to the organizational structure of the wait list or policy changes regarding the wait list, provide a narrative detailing these changes.

N/A
-----

## **Proposed MTW Activities: HUD Approval Requested**

All proposed activities that are granted approval by HUD are reported on in Section IV as 'Approved Activities'.

## Approved MTW Activities: HUD Approval Previously Granted

The following Activities are using flexibilities granted through the agency MTW agreement, have been approved by HUD, implemented by CHA and are Ongoing from the previous plan year. This Data represents April 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015. The evaluation of the CHA Moving Forward Program is being conducted by the Center for Urban and Regional Studies (CURS) at The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Their update is reported on in the Administrative section of this report.

1. *2015-1 Streamline Project-Based Vouchers (PBV) and Public Housing Regulations (ONLY APPLICABLE TO DEVELOPMENTS WITH PBV AND PH AT THE SAME DEVELOPMENT) - Approved and Implemented FY2015.*
2. CHA modified its Project-Based voucher (PBV) and Public Housing policies to blend the programs and simplify administration when units reside in the same development/building. Property managers and residents have found the programs complex to administer. The management continues to keep separate waiting lists, however they are permitted to use the same tenant selection plan, grievance policy, Uniform Physical Condition Standards (UPCS- which is typically associated with public housing program) or Housing Quality Standards (HQS - which is typically associated with Housing Choice Voucher program) inspections, and termination procedures for both programs. UPCS does not require initial inspections as HQS inspections do. However, based on CHA's MTW Agreement, the PBV units will maintain initial inspections (which can utilize on-site maintenance supervisor completion of the move-in inspection per UPCS protocol). A standard move-in form will be used.

The management of each development has created policies for eligibility, grievance, inspection and terminations which were approved by CHA's Administrative staff. CHA will charge a fee if the third party management uses CHA's grievance panel. Third party management firms may also be responsible for costs associated with annual and/or initial property inspections.

A standardized system of inspections such as UPCS ensures decent, safe and sanitary housing and minimizes the risk of substandard housing. Additionally, simplifying inspections to single inspections decreases risk, as well as errors in inspections which have to comply with multiple inspection standards. The PBV and PH units will both be monitored for quality control by CHA Asset Managers quarterly visits, annual third party UPCS inspections and REAC annual inspections if the property elects UPCS inspections.

This activity was delayed in implementation and thus impact due to timing of Plan approval and communicating the change to staff, however, it is determined to be effective.

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
<b>CE#1 Agency Cost Savings</b>				
Decrease in total cost of Initial Third Party HQS Inspection in dollars	FY2013 The current cost of HQS third party inspections is \$55	Expected to decrease cost of initial third party HQS inspections after implementation to \$0/Self-certification of Initial inspections conducted by property management	Actual cost was \$55 per inspection	No
Decrease in total cost of Annual Third Party HQS Inspection in dollars	FY2013 The current cost of Annual HQS inspection is \$55 per unit	Expected to decrease the cost of Annual Third Party HQS to \$10 per unit using UPCS Inspections	Actual cost was \$55 per inspection	No
<b>CE#2: Staff Time Savings</b>				
Decrease total time to complete the Inspections in staff hours.	Total amount of staff time dedicated to Inspections prior to implementation of the activity is 272 hours	Expected total staff time dedicated to Inspections after implementation is not expected to decrease due to potential of increased units and all units will continue to receive an annual inspection.	Actual staff time was 272 hours	Yes
<b>CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution</b>				
Decrease in the average percent error rate in completing HQS inspections at mixed developments	The average percent failed HQS inspections prior to implementation is 4%	The expected average percent failed HQS inspections after implementation is 0%.	Actual failed HQS inspections were 25%	No
Decrease in the average percent error rate in completing annual UPCS inspections at mixed developments	There is a 14.99% error rate prior to implementation of this activity	CHA anticipates no change in the error rate in the first year of implementation.	Actual late or failed UPCS Inspections at mixed income 0%	Exceeded

*Note: Appendix B lists the developments and unit type mix*



3. Benchmarks were not achieved because CHA did not begin the changed process until late into the fiscal year due to timing of approval of Plan, meetings to update the property management staff at the mixed-income developments and actual inspection times.
4. No benchmarks or metrics have been revised.
5. There is no new data collection method.



1. **2015-2 Biennial Inspection of Housing Choice Voucher Units – Approved and Implemented FY2015.**
2. CHA streamlined the Housing Quality Standards (HQS) Inspection process for tenant based voucher units. HUD requires that HQS inspections be conducted yearly on all HCV units. CHA modified the frequency of HQS inspections by inspecting qualifying housing stock biennially. Only properties and units that meet certain criteria are categorized as a High Performance Unit (HPU), thus qualifying for biennial inspections.

An HPU is defined under the following criteria:

**A minimum of two (2) consecutive passed inspections.** Any combination of inspections may be considered to qualify [i.e. (2) consecutive annual inspections (1) annual inspection and (1) initial inspection, (1) initial inspection (resident move) and (1) annual which may fall within the same year, (2) consecutive initial inspections].

As part of the HPU designation process, an owner/landlord is **required** to attend a certification seminar offered by CHA HCV inspectors and administrative staff. HQS Certification Seminar highlights may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Updates and changes to HQS standards
- Statistical summary on items that cause a high % of first-time inspection failures
- Inspection procedures, techniques and expectations
- Thorough review of HUD 52580-A Inspection Form (long version)

During the year that CHA is not conducting an inspection, the landlord and/or property manager is supplied and required to complete and return a current HUD 52580-A Inspection Form (long version). The landlord and/or property manager has 60 days to submit this form to CHA. The 60-day period is based on the anniversary date of the last HQS inspection. The landlord and/or property manager, in conjunction with the participant, is tasked with completing the form, acknowledging the completion of the form, and returning it to CHA by the specified due date. Failure to return the form within the 60-day period removes this property from a biennial inspection status. Immediately upon termination, a previously designated HPU will automatically revert to an annual scheduled system which will be conducted by CHA. CHA will continue to review public tax records to ensure that there are no tax liens on the properties.

Additionally, all complaints filed by neighbors, participants, landlords and/or property managers, amongst others, are internally investigated to ensure the integrity of the program. Any negative finding results in the immediate termination from the HPU program. HPU designated properties are subject to random yearly compliance inspections. Failure of a random quality inspection shall also be terms for immediate removal from the program. A minimum of 10% of properties designated as HPU's shall be randomly inspected by CHA on an annual basis to ensure compliance within the program.

This activity was delayed in implementation and thus impact due to timing of Plan approval and communicating the change to staff, however, it is determined to be effective.

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
<b>CE#1: Agency Cost Savings</b>				
Decrease in the total cost of HQS tenant based inspections	The activity costs \$514,675 in FY2014 (\$35x14,705) prior to implementation	The activity is expected to cost \$460,880 in FY2015 after implementation	Actual cost of HQS tenant based inspections was \$485,170 (\$35x13,862)	No
<b>CE#2: Staff Time Savings</b>				
Decrease in total staff time to complete HQS tenant based inspections	There were 7,677 hours of staff time dedicated to the task in FY2014 prior to implementation of activity	The activity is expected to take 7,241 hours of staff time in FY2015 after implementation of the activity	Actual amount of total staff time was 8,086 hours	No
<b>CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution</b>				
Average percent error rate in completing the HQS tenant based inspections on time	Average error rate of HQS tenant based inspections is 2% not completed on time prior to implementation of the biennial inspection activity	Expected average error rate of HQS tenant based inspections is 2% not completed on time after implementation of the biennial inspection activity	Actual average error rate of HQS tenant based inspections not completed on time is 1.5%	Exceeded

3. Benchmarks were not achieved because CHA did not begin the changed process until late into the fiscal year due to timing of approval of Plan.
4. The metric for average percent error was changed from tracking failed to tracking completed on time.
5. There is no new data collection method.



1. **2015-3 Public Housing No Assistance Termination Policy (MIXED-INCOME COMMUNITIES ONLY) – Approved and Implemented FY2015.**
2. CHA requests a waiver to terminate the housing of participants that reach the ceiling/market rent of the community and has income that qualifies them to pay that rent for 6 months. The household will be considered “graduated”, however, they will remain in the unit and the next market rate unit which becomes available will become a public housing unit. This policy is similar to the Housing Choice Voucher program which terminates participants after 6 months of no Housing Assistance Payment (\$0 assistance).

Metric	Baseline	Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
HC#1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available				
Increase in the number of new public housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI at mixed income communities as a result of the activity.	There were 2 housing units occupied by persons over 80% of AMI that can be leased to households at or below 80% AMI at mixed income communities prior to the start of the activity.	There are 3 additional housing units of this type expected after implementation	1	No
HC#3: Decrease in Wait List Time				
Decrease in the average applicant time on wait list in months	The average wait time prior to implementation is 6 years	The average wait time for FY2015 will be 6 years. CHA expects to see decrease in wait time in future years as more FSS participants reach the 5 year graduation mark.	The average wait time at mixed income properties with FSS is 6 years	Yes

3. The benchmark for number of Public Housing transitioned to market rate at mixed income developments was lower than targeted because CHA is looking at possible households (those that were originally considered) more carefully before making the determination. The family that transitioned actually graduated from the FSS program and is paying market rent in the development.
4. CHA revised the baseline and benchmark for FY2015, as well as the FY2016 Plan. The anticipated wait list time was calculated off of all CHA managed sites; however, the metric is for mixed-income sites with FSS.
5. There is no new data collection method.



1. **2009-1 Agency Wide Biennial Reexaminations - Approved in 2009 for elderly/disabled and implemented FY2011. Expanded Agency Wide approved and implemented FY2014.**
2. CHA has implemented a biennial schedule in all CHA managed communities and all Housing Choice Voucher (HCV), including Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH), households regardless of sources of income or type of family. Changes in income, expenses, family composition, etc. must still be reported in the administrative policy timeframes. CHA has no limits on the number of interim reexaminations processed annually at the family's request. Any changes that result in an increase in rent will be documented, but not processed until the biennial. Minimum renters are not required to complete 90-day minimum rent reviews; however, a property manager may provide resource guidance for the household.

Criminal background checks continue to be conducted annually for all household members ages 16 and older. Additionally, Enterprise Income Verification (EIV) is still used during reexamination.

Households with an anniversary in odd months are recertified in odd years (i.e. January - 2015) and households with an even month anniversary are recertified in even years (February - 2016).

The activity is on schedule and considered effective for the overall intent to reduce time spent on reexaminations to allow staff to conduct quality assurance and improved customer service.

Metric	Baseline	FY2015 Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved
CE#1: Agency Cost Savings				
Decrease in the cost of task in dollars (postage for biennial reexaminations)	Cost of postage for reexaminations prior to implementation of biennial reexaminations was \$1,973	Projected cost of postage for reexaminations after implementation of biennial reexaminations is \$1,795	There were 4,139 total reexaminations at a cost of \$1,945 in postage.	No

CE#2: Staff Time Savings				
Decrease the time to complete the task in staff hours	PH and HCV spent 3,398 hours prior to implementation of the activity	PH and HCV anticipates spending 2,418 hours	PH and HCV spent 2,621 hours	No
CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Decrease in the percentage of average error rate in on time Biennial reexaminations	Average on time reexaminations error rate was 0% for PH and .06% for HCV	CHA anticipates a 1% error rate for both programs	PH 0% HCV 0%	Exceeded
CE#5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Increase in rental revenue in dollars <sup>1</sup>	CHA had public housing rental revenue of \$4,780,996	CHA anticipates public housing rental revenue of \$3,723,776	CHA public housing rental revenue was \$3,872,072	Exceeded
SS#1: Increase in Household Income				
Average earned income of households participating in the activity	Average earned income prior to implementation \$13,326	Expected average after implementation (2.5% increase) \$13,659	Average earned income is \$12,244	No
SS#8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Increase in number of households transitioned to self sufficiency <sup>2</sup>	Households transitioned to self-sufficiency prior to implementation of the activity is 0.	Expected households transitioned to self-sufficiency after implementation of the activity is 25.	The number transitioned to self sufficiency was 15	No

3. The voucher utilization increased; therefore the estimated HCV reexaminations were higher than anticipated. Additionally, CHA's initial benchmark calculation was based on the Housing Choice Voucher program only. The average earned income benchmark was not achieved and CHA attributes it to the significant number of households pulled from the HCV wait list that were at or below 30% of the AMI.
4. Benchmarks for the cost and hours for reexamination were adjusted to include Public Housing.
5. There is no new data collection method.

<sup>1</sup> Rental revenue in this report is for Public Housing only

<sup>2</sup> CHA's definition of self-sufficiency is positive move out to housing with no subsidy



1. ***2010- 1 Rent Reform and Work Requirement - Approved FY2010, Implemented FY2011.***
2. While elderly and disabled are not required to participate in the work requirement, they are mandated to participate in rent reform. Rent simplification applies to both CHA's public housing and HCV programs. The rent reform and work requirement are split. Only communities receiving case management services are under the work requirement.

The activity is on schedule and effective. The new rent calculation is an income-based, stepped rent with stepped escrow deposits. The income bands are a \$2,500 range with the stepped rent being 30% of the range low end. For example, in a \$5,000 - \$7,499 annual income band, the low end of \$5,000 is divided by the 12 months of the year and multiplied by 30%. The total rent payment by the tenant would be \$125. Annual adjusted income will be used to establish the income band. Incentive deposits will begin when the household adjusted income including wages reaches \$12,500 and ends when the household adjusted income reaches 70% of Area Median Income (AMI) or 3 years after reaching 40% of AMI, whichever comes first. Incentive accounts can be disbursed for any reason when they leave subsidized housing if they leave in good standing. But while they continue to receive a subsidy, withdrawals are limited to amounts needed to help participants overcome specific verifiable barriers to work. A ceiling rent was established at CHA Fair Market Rents (public housing only) by bedroom size and is reviewed/updated annually.

Participants are still granted interim rent reexaminations between biennial reexaminations provided they have met the established criteria. If there is a decrease in the family's income or an increase in medical expense or childcare expense which is expected to last longer than thirty days (and will change their flat deduction eligibility), the participant may request that an interim reexamination be performed. Participants must still report changes in family size.

Income earned by seasonal employment will be annualized on a 12 month basis if the employee has maintained employment for more than 60 days. Employees of temporary agencies will be annualized after an initial 30 days of assignments.

Income from assets with a combined value of \$5,000 or less will be excluded. The annual reexamination will include self certification for households with combined assets at or below \$5,000, or third party verification for assets over \$5,000. Traditional medical and childcare deductions are eliminated. Participants need only verify enough non-reimbursable expenses to meet the requested deduction level listed below.

Medical Expenses	Medical Deduction	Childcare Expense	Childcare Deduction
\$0 - \$2,499	\$0	\$0 - \$2,499	\$0
\$2,500 - \$4,999	\$2,500	\$2,500 - \$4,999	\$2,500
\$5,000 - \$7,499	\$5,000	\$5000 - \$7,499	\$5,000
\$7,500+	\$7,500	\$7,500+	\$7,500

### Work Requirement

CHA introduced a work requirement where the head of household will be expected to work full-time in the final phase (however, the requirement can be fulfilled by any adult in the household or a combination of the adults in the household). Full-time work is defined as employment for 30 hours or more per week.

The program began launching the Work Requirement in December of 2013. Notices were sent to all residents in January 2014 stating they had a 60-day grace-period before sanctions began on April 1, 2014, as they were at the end of the Introductory Period. Sites impacted by the Work Requirement were the five supportive services pilot communities receiving case management which included Victoria Square, Claremont, Cedar Knoll, Leafcrest and Tarlton Hills. All non-working residents (except the elderly and persons with disabilities) who wanted supportive services at these sites, underwent an assessment to determine the extent of any barriers to work. Participants who were prepared for work were encouraged to look for work. Participants who were not prepared were given other work participation activities to help them prepare for work, including life skills education, volunteering opportunities, and short-term vocational training. The Housing Choice Voucher participants are not included in the work requirement at this time.

During the first introductory phase of the program, no participants will be sanctioned for failure to comply with the policy. This will give participants time to address barriers to work and better understand the policy.

After the introductory phase has passed, head of households will be expected to exhibit a good-faith effort to find work for a minimum of 15 hours a week and/or participate in other work participation activities, if determined to be appropriate by the case manager. Each additional adult household member will increase the hours of work required by 5 hours/week (i.e. 3 adult household members would be  $15 + 5 + 5 = 25$  hours per week for the household).

At the beginning of the final phase of the work requirement, CHA will begin requiring the head of household to work full-time (at least 30 hours/week). Each additional adult household member will increase the number of work hours required by 10 hours/week (i.e. 3 adult household members would be  $30 + 10 + 10 = 50$  hours per week for the household).

Residents who fail to comply with the terms of the work requirement policy may be sanctioned. The sanctions will increase in magnitude the longer a participant is in non-compliance, and shall be applied in phases as follows:

Improvement Period: Participant will have a two (2) month grace period to cure non-compliance. If not cured within two (2) months, probationary sanctions will be applied. Residents may be granted extensions if it is in compliance with their established improvement plan.

Probationary Period: Participant will lose 50% of their rental assistance for up to six (6) months. If they fail to correct the non-compliance within six (6) months, non-compliance sanctions will be applied.



**Non-Compliance Period:** Participant will lose 100% of their rental assistance for six (6) months and will be required to pay the established market rent. Participant still has the option to cure the non-compliance during the 6-month period while they are paying market rent. If the participant fails to cure the non-compliance by the end of the 6-month period they will continue to pay market rent and move to termination.

**Termination:** Termination will begin and the participant's incentive account, if any, is forfeited due to non-compliance. When applicable (the work requirement does not apply to HCV at this time), HCV participants will lose their voucher eligibility permanently, but can remain unassisted in their current unit; for public housing residents they will lose their eligibility for public housing assistance, will pay market rent for the unit and their lease will be terminated for program non-compliance at the annual renewal.

Residents who have a second incident of probation within twelve (12) months of the initial incident of probation will move directly to the non-compliance period of the sanctions.

Residents who have a third improvement period occurrence within twenty-four (24) months of the initial incident of probation will move directly to the non-compliance period of the sanctions.

Metric	Baseline	FY2015 Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<b>CE#1: Agency Cost Savings</b>				
Total cost of rent reform in dollars	The cost of task prior to implementation of activity is \$67,960	The expected cost of task after implementation is \$48,374.	The cost of the task after implementation of activity decreased to \$52,420	No
<b>CE#2: Staff Time Savings</b>				
Decrease total time to complete the task in staff hours.	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity is 3,398 hours	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity is 995 hours	Total actual time in hours is 2,621	No
<b>CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution</b>				
Decrease in average error rate in rent calculation task as a percentage.	To be set in FY2015.	N/A	N/A	N/A



CE#5: Increase in Agency Rental Revenues				
Increase in rental revenue in dollars	CHA had public housing rental revenue of \$4,780,996	CHA anticipates public housing rental revenue of \$3,723,776	CHA public housing rental revenue was \$3,872,072	Exceeded
SS#1: Increase in Household Income				
Average earned income of households participating in the Rent Reform activity	Average earned income prior to implementation \$13,326	Expected average after implementation (2.5% increase) \$13,659	Average earned income is \$12,244	No
SS#2: Increase in Household Savings				
Average amount of savings/escrow <sup>3</sup> of households participating in the Rent Reform activity	The average amount of savings/escrow of households participating prior to implementation was \$0	The average amount of savings/escrow of households participating after implementation is expected to be \$982 per household	Actual average amount of savings/escrow is \$1,166	Exceeded
SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Increase in the number of head(s) of households employed full-time <sup>4</sup>	MFSS Head(s) of households employed full time prior to implementation of rent reform activity was 46	Anticipated MFSS Head of Household employed full time is 76	Actual MFSS Head of Household employed full time is 75	No
SS#4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)				
Decrease in number of households receiving TANF assistance	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity is 349	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity is 231.	Actual number of households receiving TANF is 292	No

<sup>3</sup> The average escrow balance includes households in the traditional FSS program and the Rent Reform Incentive Accounts

<sup>4</sup> CHA uses the families participating in the Moving Forward Supportive Services because the current software does not have a report for full or part time hours, nor who in the house has earned income.

SS#5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency				
Increase in number of households receiving services aimed to increase self-sufficiency.	Households receiving self-sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity is 308	Anticipated number of households to receive services is 190	Actual households that receive services is 295	Exceeded
SS#6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households				
Decrease in average amount of HCV and Section 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity is \$547 for HCV HAP and \$359 for PH	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity is \$547 for HCV HAP and \$359 for PH	Actual average HAP is \$551 for HCV and \$375 for PH PEL	
SS#8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Increase in number of households transitioned to self sufficiency <sup>5</sup> .	Households transitioned to self-sufficiency prior to implementation of the activity is 0	Expected households transitioned to self-sufficiency after implementation of the activity is 25.	The number transitioned to self sufficiency was 15	

For a full description of the Rent Reform Initiative, see The Hardship Policy, Work Requirement, Rent Reform Overview and examples of alternative rent schedules included in the Appendices.

- i. There were 98 hardship requests in FY2015 of which 74 were approved.
3. The benchmarks for cost, staff time and HAP were not achieved because the voucher utilization increased. The benchmark for average earned income was not achieved because CHA transitioned over 800 households from the voucher wait list to the program and those individuals were 30% and below.
4. No benchmarks or metrics have been revised.
5. There is no new data collection method.

---

<sup>5</sup> CHA defines self-sufficiency as positive move outs with no housing subsidy



1. **2008-2 Participant and Landlord Tracking Program - Approved and Implemented FY2008.**

2. The agency began tracking the locations of Housing Choice Vouchers in order to address de-concentration of poverty and increase access to affordable housing opportunities in non-concentrated areas.

Using the Geographic Information Science (GIS) mapping services of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte (UNCC), CHA identified each voucher holder within Mecklenburg County (Charlotte, Pineville, Huntersville, Mint Hill, Matthews, Davidson, Cornelius). The results of the mapping indicated that 75% (3,206 of 4,268) of Housing Choice Voucher holders reside in 8 concentrated zip codes within the City of Charlotte (28208, 28215, 28216, 28205, 28217, 28212, 28269, and 28213). CHA identified where both poverty and Housing Choice Voucher participation is low in order to design a program which would encourage participants to move into those areas.

CHA began including information on the benefits of residing in low poverty areas in the voucher briefings, including a list of amenities in non-concentrated zip codes. No additional services are provided to the household. CHA has also worked on reducing this percentage by actively visiting apartment complex management companies, and speaking with landlords who own or manage properties outside of the concentrated areas. Additionally, CHA has formed a Landlord Advisory Group to assist in recruiting properties for Housing Choice Voucher leases and a Neighborhood Advisory Group to solicit suggestions and feedback on how to improve the perception of the Housing Choice Voucher program.

It is noted that the % change can be impacted by the utilization rate and number of vouchers available; therefore, the actual number of vouchers in the concentrated area is critical to realizing movement for de-concentration purposes. The activity is on schedule and effective. Project Based vouchers and port outs are excluded from the count.

Metric	Baseline	FY2015 Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
HC#5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity (increase)	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity is 25% or 1,062 of 4,268	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhoods of opportunity after implementation to 1,280	Actual number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhoods of opportunity was 1,425	Exceeded

HC#7: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Housing Choice				
Increase in the number of households receiving services aimed to increase housing choice	Households receiving this type of service prior to implementation of the activity is 0.	Anticipated number of households to receive services is 190	Actual households that receive services is 295	Exceeded

3. Benchmarks were achieved.
4. There was no change in the benchmark or metric.
5. The data collection method did not change.



1. **2008-2 Adopt Investment Policies Consistent with State Law - Approved and Implemented FY2009.**
2. CHA invests only in securities authorized under NC state law that allow the flexibility to invest productively and efficiently to achieve a portfolio which is safer, more liquid, and obtains competitive yield. CHA's investments are performed in accordance with HUD regulations and North Carolina Statutes. This activity has allowed CHA to achieve higher earnings on idle funds in a safer, more liquid environment. The activity is on schedule and effective.

CHA's investment policy restricts amounts deposited or invested for different types of investments as a percentage of the overall portfolio. The agency has less ability to invest in commercial paper than in previous years and investments are not yielding as well as in previous years, however, the agency continues to compare the NC investments portfolio to HUD's portfolio and maintains it is gaining more interest on dollars leveraged in the NC portfolio.

Metric	Baseline	FY2015 Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
CE#4: Increase in Resources Leveraged				
Increase amount of funds leveraged in dollars	The increase in amount of funds leveraged prior to the start of this activity was \$0	The expected amount of funds leveraged after this activity is \$45,000	\$55,370.58	Yes

3. Benchmarks were achieved.
4. There was no change in the benchmark or metric.
5. The data collection method did not change.



1. **2009 - 3 Modify Section 8 Inspection Procedures - Approved and Implemented FY2009.**

2. CHA uses a local building standards inspection and subsequent issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy (CO) instead of the required initial Housing Quality Standard (HQS) inspection for the initial or move-in inspection on newly constructed project-based or tenant-based voucher units. The activity is on schedule and effective.

At the start of the activity, the HQS inspection was \$50. It is now \$55. CHA was able to save \$440 by using the Mecklenburg County Building Standards Certificate of Occupancy for 8 of the scheduled 23 Project Based Voucher units at the Residences at The Renaissance.

Metric	Baseline	FY2015 Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<b>CE#1: Agency Cost Savings</b>				
Decrease in total cost of task in dollars	The cost of HQS inspections was \$50 prior to implementation of the activity (114 units at \$5,700).	The expected cost of the task is \$0 after implementation of the activity.	The actual dollars spent was \$0	Yes
<b>CE#2: Staff Time Savings</b>				
Decrease in the total time to complete the task in staff hours	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity was 57 hours.	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity is 0.	The actual staff time spent was 0	Yes
<b>CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution</b>				
Decrease in the average percent error rate in completing inspections	The average percent failed inspections prior to implementation is 0%	The expected average percent failed inspections after implementation is 0%.	The actual percent failed was 0%	Yes

3. Benchmarks were achieved.
4. There were no changes to the metrics or benchmarks.
5. The data collection method did not change.



1. *2009 - 4 Community Based Rental Assistance -Approved and Implemented FY2009, (expanded) FY2011.*

2. CHA operates Traditional Project-Based voucher, Supportive Housing Project-Based and Local Rental Subsidy programs for implementation of Community Based Rental Assistance (CBRA). At the start of this initiative, the City of Charlotte produced a Quality of Life study which classified neighborhoods as “stable”, “challenged” or “threatened”. The City has discontinued use of those terms recognizing the potential negative impact of labeling neighborhoods. CHA now looks at the percent of households below the poverty level.

There is no annual benchmark for this activity because the CHA Board of Commissioners approves CBRA projects on a case by case basis. In selecting families to occupy Project-Based Voucher (PBV) units CHA has delegated determination of program and project eligibility to the PBV owner agent. CHA retains the flexibility to use, as necessary, the public housing program guidelines for PBV participants that reside in mixed-finance communities with regard to various operational and procedural functions, including but not limited to forming resident organizations, grievance procedures, etc. This streamlined approach creates consistency for residents and efficiencies in application for staff. The activity is on schedule and effective.

#### **Traditional Activity**

In FY2009, CHA was approved to implement a Community Based Rental Assistance (CBRA) program. The activity was implemented in FY2009. CHA adopted a CBRA process (See Appendix D) to simplify the selection process in order to maximize the number of quality project-based voucher units throughout Charlotte. CHA revised the Community Based Rental Assistance Policy in May 2013 to further increase efforts for deconcentrating poverty and expanding housing and economic opportunities. There were 8 new traditional project-based vouchers added in FY2015 (The Residences at Renaissance).

#### **Supportive Housing Project-Based Activity**

In FY2009, CHA was approved to implement *Housing for Persons with Disabilities, Special Needs, and Homeless*. The activity was implemented in FY2009. The activity enables CHA to expand its role in the supportive housing community by leveraging funding and resources to social service and supportive housing providers. This will help alleviate the existing housing burden, as well as increase the housing subsidy opportunities in the Charlotte community.

The activity has impacted Charlotte’s supportive housing projects by enabling local agencies to produce additional units for the targeted population to fill a needed void in Charlotte’s continuum of care. Without CHA’s fund leveraging or resource commitment, projects may be delayed or not occur. CHA encourages the use of housing subsidies in these partnerships.

Through MTW flexibility, CHA allows supportive housing programs to operate on a month to month lease, rather than requiring them to modify their program to comply with existing HUD regulations requiring 12 month initial leases. This is significant in respect to non-compliance and participant termination.

- The average cost per family for supportive services is not paid for or contracted with CHA. Actual services range from \$3,800 to 7,500 per family for housing and services.
- During FY2015, CHA added 30 new project-based vouchers for supportive housing at Weyland II (housing development for substance abuse victims) and

McCreesh Scattered Sites (housing for men with severe disabilities who are homeless or at risk of becoming homeless).

**Local Rental Subsidy Activity**

The activity was approved in FY2011 as a second amendment to the Plan. The activity was implemented in FY2011.

CHA has two Local Rental Subsidy program partnerships.

- Charlotte Family Housing (CFH) is provided a housing subsidy of up to \$500 per month to a maximum of 50 homeless families receiving intensive supportive services (10 to 15 families that need employment and 35 to 40 for working households). Working households are expected to complete the self-sufficiency program within three years with a one year extension and non-working families are given a four year program requirement with a one year extension.

This is a 50-unit pilot program with similar requirements and processes as Charlotte Family Housing's current housing program. The program's criteria are required for each respective group; however, if those referred families are on CHA's waiting list, they will have preference. CFH established operating procedures, landlord relationships, and administrative staff to deliver wrap-around services. The partnership enables delivery of supportive services at no cost to CHA.

The families are either working or participating in a self-sufficiency or educational program and earning less than 30% of the Area Median Income (AMI). The program targets families who are situationally or transitionally homeless. The program may also provide for the use of the subsidy to prevent homelessness by providing assistance to families ready for transition from local shelters. It is a collaborative effort that joins local agencies which are already providing services to this community with funds from the faith community, the corporate community, and the public sector. CFH uses "the ability to pay" method which bases the tenants rental portion on net income and actual expenses. CHA has implemented the 30% rule until CFH can provide an updated recalculation policy. CHA pays a subsidy of up to \$500 to help pay the remaining rental amount. The goal is to help families achieve self-sufficiency within three to five years by providing comprehensive family development via social work, intensive case management, and access to services while the family is permanently housed in a stable apartment community.

- In the last month of FY2015 CHA allocated subsidies for up to 50 families to A Child's Place to initiate A Stable Home program to assist homeless children and their families who are attending Charlotte- Mecklenburg Schools. Referrals are made from the school counselor to a social worker at A Child's Place. The family is eligible for assistance for a period of three years and is eligible for a voucher immediately after program completion, if they are on our wait list. Supportive services are offered to the family through the counselor and CHA's HCV FSS program.

Metric	Baseline	FY2015 Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<b>Traditional Activity</b>				
<b>CE#1: Agency Cost Savings</b>				
Decrease of total cost of task (supportive services) in dollars.	Cost of task (supportive services) prior to implementation of the activity is \$0	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity (supportive services) is \$2,300.	Cost of task after implementation is \$1,300 per family per year	Yes
<b>CE#2: Staff Time Savings</b>				
Decrease total time to complete the task (process PBV payments) in staff hours	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task (process PBV payments) prior to implementation of the activity is 0	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task (process pbv payments) after implementation of the activity is 108 hours per year	Total amount of staff time to complete the task is 108 hours in staff hours	Yes
<b>CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution</b>				
Decrease average error rate in completing a task (HAP calculation) as a percentage.	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity is TBD during FY2015	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Supportive Housing Project-Based Activity</b>				
<b>CE#4: Increase in Resources Leveraged</b>				
Increase in amount of funds leveraged in dollars	Amount of leverage prior to implementation of the activity is \$0.	Expected amount leveraged after implementation of the activity is \$2,300 per family for supportive services	The amount leveraged after implementation of the activity is \$5,650 per family for supportive services	Exceeded



HC#5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Number of new housing units made available for special needs, homeless or disabled households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity (increase)	114	Anticipate 43 PBV and 75 PH units (Total 118) will be made available at Renaissance	Actual Supportive Housing PBV units made available were 30	No
Local Rental Subsidy Activity				
CE#1: Agency Cost Savings				
Decrease in total cost of task (cost of average HAP) in dollars	Cost of task (average HAP) prior to implementation of the activity \$547	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity is \$489	The cost of the average HAP is \$486.	Exceeded
CE#2: Staff Time Savings				
Decrease in total time to complete the task (process HAP) in staff hours	Total amount of staff time (process HAP) dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity is 0.	Expected amount of total staff time (process HAP) dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity is 36 hours per year	The total time to complete the task is not expected to decrease. Annual staff hours total 36 hours.	N/A
CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Decrease average error rate in completing a task (HAP calculation) as a percentage.	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity is TBD during FY2015	N/A	N/A	N/A
CE#4: Increase in Resources Leveraged				
Increase in amount of funds leveraged in dollars	Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity (supportive services) is \$0.	Expected amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (supportive services) is \$5,000 per family.	The amount leveraged after implementation of the activity (supportive services) is \$5,000 per family.	Yes

SS#1: Increase in Household Income				
Increase in average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars.	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation was not available to CHA. The baseline is set at \$12,322	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy after implementation of this activity is \$12,630 (2.5%)	The actual average earned income is \$12,793	Exceeded
SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
Employed Full Time	TBD	Expected head of households employed full time after implementation is 50.	The actual number of full time households is 17	No
SS#4: Households Removed from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)				
Decrease in number of households receiving TANF assistance.	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity is 0.	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity is 0.	There was no change. Households with TANF remain at 0.	Yes
SS#5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency				
Increase in number of households receiving services aimed to increase self sufficiency.	Households receiving self sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity is 0.	Expected number of households receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity is 50.	Household receiving self-sufficiency services after implementation of the activity is 44.	No
SS#6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households				
Decrease in total cost of task (cost of HAP) in dollars	Cost of task prior to implementation of the activity \$0	Expected cost of task (average HAP) after implementation of the activity \$489.	Cost of task after implementation is \$486.	Exceeded

SS#7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Increase in rental revenue in dollars	Households in this program lease from private landlords. There is no impact on rental revenue for CHA	N/A	N/A	N/A
SS#8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Increase in number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (no subsidy)	Households transitioned to self sufficiency (no subsidy) prior to implementation of the activity is 0.	Expected households transitioned to self sufficiency after implementation of the activity is 1.	Households transitioned to self sufficiency after implementation is 5	Exceeded
HC#5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Increase in number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity.	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity is 0.	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation is 50.	There were 44 households able to move to a better unit or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity.	No

3. Moore Place construction was delayed, therefore all of the anticipated Supportive Housing PBV's were not issued. The program selects households from CHA's waiting list therefore the activity is still effective and will continue. With the exception of 5, all households at Charlotte Family Housing had earned income, but not all households had earned income which added up to full time wages.
4. The benchmarks and metrics were not revised.
5. The data collection method did not change.



1. **2009-5 Moving Forward Supportive Services (formerly Currents of Change) - Approved and Implemented FY2009.**
2. The activity is on schedule and effective. In previous contracts for supportive services funding was provided for the entire family. The scope of services limits the focus and investment to the head of household, though services can still be provided to other family members in the

household. The revised contract reduced the cost per household for supportive services to \$1,300 per year.

Moving Forward Supportive Services are provided to two pilot groups. In the Annual Report we break the sites out into three pilots: Victoria Square and Claremont Pilot 1, Boulevard as Pilot 2 and Cedar Knoll, Leafcrest and Tarlton Hills as Pilot 3. However, under CHA's Moving Forward programming we divide the sites up by program or group. The HOPE VI group, Moving Forward Group 1 (Claremont, Victoria Square and HCV) and Moving Forward Group 2 (Cedar Knoll, Leafcrest and Tarlton Hills). The Client Services Department previously tracked a comparison site; Dillehay Courts. Dillehay is a large conventional public housing community that does not currently receive supportive services. With the approved changes for Biennial Reexaminations the Dillehay Courts comparison group will no longer be used in the FY 14-15 year and going forward, as the numbers no longer reflect current incomes and wages.

**Moving Forward Supportive Services-FSS Program:**

CHA administers the Moving Forward Supportive Services (MFSS) Program, which operates in our conventional sites located at Claremont, Victoria Square as well as in the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program (Group 1). This program is the combination of the traditional family self-sufficiency (FSS) program and the newer MTW Moving Forward Self-Sufficiency program. In 2010, FSS contracts were no longer offered and those who were under a traditional FSS 5-year contract had the option to remain under their FSS contract or roll under the new Moving Forward Supportive Services program. Under this program, applicants must be willing to finish a high school diploma or earn a GED during participation in the program. During the first twelve (12) months they are encouraged to become employed a minimum of 15 hours per week and willing to enroll in school and/or job training. After the introductory period, the work requirement applies and they are required to be working and/or in an approved job training program. Applicants must demonstrate motivation towards self-sufficiency. Although the contract of participation is still a part of the Moving Forward Supportive Services program, a time frame is not set. Continual progress towards self-sufficiency is expected with an average program time being seven (7) years.

**Moving Forward Supportive Services Program:**

Beginning April 1, 2013, CHA provides self-sufficiency programming to three conventional public housing sites: (Cedar Knoll, Leafcrest, and Tarlton Hills- Group 2) that were previously being served by an outside case management agency. As of April 2014, Grace-Mar, Inc. provides the self-sufficiency programming to our relocated Boulevard Homes families *who have not* relocated back to the revitalized community of Renaissance (Group 2). Renaissance West Community Initiative (RWCI) was contracted to oversee the supportive services at the Renaissance and The Retreat at Renaissance which includes serving those Boulevard original families who chose to return to the revitalized community. As of this report there are a total of 15 original Boulevard Homes' families that returned to the revitalized community.

Like the Moving Forward Group 1 program, applicants must be willing to finish a high school diploma or earn a GED during participation in the program. During the first twelve

(12) months they are encouraged to become employed a minimum of 15 hours per week and willing to enroll in school and/or job training. After the introductory period, the work requirement applies and they are required to be working and/or in an approved job training program. Applicants must demonstrate motivation towards self-sufficiency. Although the contract of participation is still a part of the Moving Forward program, a time frame is not set. Continual progress towards self-sufficiency is expected with an average program time being seven (7) years. Many of the active participants in this program have a lot of barriers to self-sufficiency.

**Metrics are determined on an annual basis due to program attrition.**

CHA (Claremont, Victoria Square)				
Metric	Baseline (April 2013)	FY2015 Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
CE#1: Agency Cost Savings				
Decrease in total cost of task (average supportive services) in dollars.	Cost of task (average supportive services) prior to implementation of the activity is \$2,600 per household	Expected cost after implementation of the activity is \$2,300 per household	Actual cost of task is \$1,300 per household	Yes
CE#2: Staff Time Savings				
Total time to complete the task (case management) in staff hours	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity is 120.	Expected amount of total staff time after implementation of the activity is 100 hours monthly	Actual hours of staff time was 203 hours monthly	Exceeded
CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Decrease in average error rate in completing a task (inactive head of household) as a percentage.	Average error rate of task (inactive head of household) prior to implementation of the activity is 0%	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity is 0%	Actual error rate of task (unemployed, inactive head of household) is 0%	Yes

CE#4: Increase in Resources Leveraged				
Increase in amount of funds leveraged in dollars	Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity is \$0	Expected amount leveraged after implementation of the activity is \$10,000	Actual amount leveraged is \$2,120	No
SS#1: Increase in Household Income				
Increase in average earned income (1% increase) of households affected by this policy in dollars.	Averaged earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity is \$9,163	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy after implementation of this activity is \$12,343	Actual average earned income is \$13,892	Exceeded
SS#2: Increase in household savings				
Increase average amount of escrow of households affected by this policy in dollars.	Average escrow amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity is \$1,879	Expected average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity is \$1,517 (1%)	Average escrow amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity is \$1,517	Yes
SS#3 Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
# Employed FT (32+)	14	24	23	No
# Employed PT (1-31)	38	54	54	Yes
Enrolled in an Educational Program	7	13	2	No
Enrolled in Job Training Program	7	13	2	No
Unemployed	32	≤37	10	Yes
Other (workshop)	0	26	23	No
SS#4: Households Removed from TANF				
Decrease in number of households receiving TANF assistance	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity is 0	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity is 0	Number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity is 0	Yes

SS#5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency				
Increase in number of households receiving services aimed to increase self sufficiency.	Households receiving self sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity is 14	Expected number of households receiving self sufficiency services after implementation is 52	Actual number of households receiving self-sufficiency is 78	Yes
SS#6: Reducing per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households				
Decrease in average amount of Section 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars.	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of this activity is \$391	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity is \$387	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity is \$408	No
SS#7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Increase in rental revenue in dollars	CHA had public housing rental revenue of \$4,780,996	CHA anticipates public housing rental revenue of \$3,723,776 for FY2015	CHA public housing rental revenue was \$3,872,072	Yes
SS#8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Increase in number of households transitioned to self sufficiency.	0	2	8	Yes
CHS (Boulevard Homes Originals)				
Metric	Baseline (April 2013)	FY2015 Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
CE#1: Agency Cost Savings				
Decrease in total cost of task (average supportive services) in dollars.	Cost of task (average supportive services) prior to implementation of the activity is \$2,600 per household	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity is \$2,300 per household	Actual cost of supportive services per household is \$1,300	Yes

CE#2: Staff Time Savings				
Total time to complete the task (case management) in staff hours	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity is 120.	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity is 100 hours monthly	Actual hours of staff time dedicated is 174 hours per month	No
CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Decrease in average error rate in completing a task (inactive head of household) as a percentage	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity is 7%	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity is 9%	Actual error rate is 8.9%	Yes
CE#4: Increase in Resources Leveraged				
Increase in amount of funds leveraged in dollars	Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity is \$0	Expected amount leveraged after implementation of the activity is \$10,000	\$67,443	Yes
SS#1: Increase in Household Income				
Increase in average earned income (0% increase) of households affected by this policy in dollars.	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity is \$7,354	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity is \$8,872	Actual average earned income is \$15,077	Yes
SS#2: Increase in Household Savings				
Increase average amount of savings of households affected by this policy in dollars.	Average savings amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity is \$1,118	Expected average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity is \$1,181	Actual savings of households is \$1,260	Yes



SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
# Employed FT (32+)	24	22	29	Yes
# Employed PT (1-31)	32	37	39	Yes
Enrolled in an Educational Program	7	7	54	Yes
Enrolled in Job Training Program	7	7	56	Yes
Unemployed	32	95	56	Yes
Other (workshop)	0	37	28	No
SS#4: Households removed from TANF				
Decrease in number of households receiving TANF assistance.	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity is 0.	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity is 4.	The actual number of households receiving TANF is 12.	No
SS#5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency				
Increase number of households receiving services aimed to increase self sufficiency	Households receiving self sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity is 20	Expected number of households receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity is 51	111	Yes
SS#6: Reducing per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households				
Decrease average amount of Section 8 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars.	The participating households in this group are a combination of voucher and public housing residents (HOPE VI relocation) and are not coded in one group in the software system to pull this data.			
SS#7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Increase in rental revenue in dollars	CHA had public housing rental revenue of \$4,780,996	CHA anticipates public housing rental revenue of \$3,723,776 for FY2015	CHA public housing rental revenue was \$3,872,072	Yes
SS#8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Increase number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (no subsidy)	Households transitioned to self sufficiency (no subsidy) is 0	Expected to transition to self sufficiency is 1	Actual households transitioned to self-sufficiency is 4	Yes

CHA (Cedar Knoll, Leafcrest, Tarlton Hills)				
Metric	Baseline (April 2013)	FY2015 Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
CE#1: Agency Cost Savings				
Decrease in total cost of task (average supportive services) in dollars.	Cost of task (average supportive services) prior to implementation of the activity is \$2,600 per household	Expected cost of task after implementation of the activity is \$2,300 per household	Actual cost is \$1,300 per households	Yes
CE#2: Staff Time Savings				
Total time to complete the task (case management) in staff hours	Total amount of staff time dedicated to the task prior to implementation of the activity is 120.	Expected amount of total staff time dedicated to the task after implementation of the activity is 100 hours monthly	Actual staff time per month is 123 hours	No
CE#3: Decrease in Error Rate of Task Execution				
Decrease in average error rate in completing a task (inactive head of household) as a percentage	Average error rate of task prior to implementation of the activity is 32%	Expected average error rate of task after implementation of the activity is 30%	Average error rate is 58%	No
CE#4: Increase in Resources Leveraged				
Increase in amount of funds leveraged in dollars	Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity is \$0	Expected amount leveraged after implementation of the activity is \$10,000.	Actual amount leveraged is \$2,880	No
SS#1: Increase in Household Income				
Increase in average earned income (0% increase) of households affected by this policy in dollars	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity is \$6,499	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity is \$11,755	Actual average earned income is \$13,977	Yes

SS#2: Increase in Household Savings				
Increase average amount of savings of households affected by this policy in dollars	Average savings amount of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity is \$548	Expected average savings/escrow amount of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity is \$742	Actual average savings/escrow amount is \$1,414	Exceeded
SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status				
# Employed FT (32+)	8	30	23	No
# Employed PT (1-31)	15	16	37	Yes
Enrolled in an Educational Program	7	23	31	Exceeded
Enrolled in Job Training Program	7	23	31	Exceeded
Unemployed	32	108	56	Exceeded
Other (workshop)	0	41	2	No
SS#4: Households Removed from TANF				
Decrease in number of households receiving TANF assistance	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity is 12	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity is 12	Actual households receiving TANF 7	Exceeded
SS#5: Households Assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency				
Increase number of households receiving services aimed to increase self sufficiency	Households receiving self sufficiency services prior to implementation of the activity is 31.	Expected number of households receiving self sufficiency services after implementation of the activity is 87	106	Exceeded
SS#6: Reducing per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households				
Decrease average amount of Section 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars.	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity is \$397	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity is \$395	Actual average subsidy per household is \$411	No

SS#7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue				
Increase in rental revenue in dollars	CHA had public housing rental revenue of \$4,780,996	CHA anticipates public housing rental revenue of \$3,723,776 for FY2015	CHA public housing rental revenue was \$3,872,072	Exceeded
SS#8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency				
Increase number of households transitioned to self sufficiency (no subsidy)	Households transitioned to self sufficiency (no subsidy) prior to implementation of the activity is 0	Expected households transitioned to self sufficiency (no subsidy) is 3	Actual households transitioned to self-sufficiency is 0	No

**NOTE:**

1. All metrics are taken from the FY2015 program metrics.
3. The Project Expense Level (PEL) is an estimate of the cost to operate each project, exclusive of taxes, utilities and certain add-ons. CHA's subsidy assistance at a property has multiple variables outside of tenant rent that will influence the PEL. Escrow amounts did not increase as predicted since some households moved out, taking their escrow payments with them. New households would not have escrows to counter the removals. CHA began serving the Head of Household rather than the entire family which reduced the cost of supportive services per household.
4. The baselines and benchmarks are reset each year to reflect the population being served.
5. The data collection methods have not changed.



1. **2009 - 7 Increase Acquisition and Rehabilitation of Existing Multi-Family Properties - Approved and Implemented FY2009 (expanded FY2012).**
2. CHA received approval to expand this initiative to acquire and rehabilitate existing multi-family properties in mixed-income communities. CHA has found acquisition more cost effective and, at times, it has allowed the agency to add more units to the inventory in a shorter period of time than new construction. Current new construction is at \$120,000 or more per unit. Individuals who resided at the acquired properties were relocated as necessary in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Act. The remaining occupied units are filled through attrition with ACC or Project-Based units as they become vacant. Using MTW flexibility, CHA has acquired 918 units, each costing less than \$81,000 per unit.

The activity is on schedule and effective. The agency target for FY2015 was to analyze expiring Low Income Housing Tax Credit sites previously funded through the HOPE VI Program. CHA also pursued work force development opportunities via acquisition of existing sites or development of affordable housing on existing properties owned by CHA.

Metric	Baseline	FY2015 Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<b>CE#1: Agency Cost Savings</b>				
Decrease in total cost of task (acquire units)	Cost of task (acquire units) prior to implementation of the activity was \$120,000 per unit for new construction	\$0	\$0	Yes
<b>HC#1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available</b>				
Increase in number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity.	There were 0 housing units of this type prior to implementation of this activity.	There were 0 units planned for FY2015.	0	Yes
<b>HC#4: Displacement Prevention</b>				
Decrease in number of households at or below 80% AMI that would lose assistance or need to move.	Households losing assistance/moving prior to implementation of the activity was 0	Expected displacement is 0	0	Yes
<b>HC#5: Increase in Resident Mobility</b>				
Increase in number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity.	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity was 0.	Increase in resident mobility is 0	0	Yes

3. The benchmark for Increase in Resident Mobility was decreased from 22 to 0 because the 22 pertained to the target agency wide, not just for existing properties on the market acquired by CHA. The benchmark should have been 0 to align with the benchmark of 0 acquisitions.
4. There are no revised benchmarks or metrics.
5. The data collection method has not changed.



1. **2009 – 8 Land Acquisition for Future Use –Approved and Implemented FY2009.**

2. The purpose of the activity is to secure as many good locations, if possible, along the new transit corridors and light rail as well as in rapidly developing areas of Charlotte to expand housing choices. MTW flexibility allows CHA to acquire sites without prior HUD approval, providing that the agency certifies that HUD site selection requirements have been met. This allows CHA to be proactive and competitive in the market when land becomes available. CHA has a surplus of land in inventory, but is experiencing challenges in securing development financing; therefore acquiring additional land is not a priority at this time.

Steele Creek Seniors has been developed. A tax credit application was approved on the 2.2 acre parcel at Park and Marsh, which is now being developed for construction of a 92 unit Project-Based Section 8, mid rise, senior housing development. CHA will have a Community Services Coordinator at the development, and supportive services will be offered, but voluntary. The average rental price in the communities surrounding the Park and Marsh development is \$1,242. Krefeld Drive is a property that has been land banked and development scenarios are being assessed for the future. The activity is on schedule and effective.

Metric	Baseline	FY2015 Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
HC#1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available				
Increase in number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity.	There were 0 housing units of this type prior to implementation of this activity.	There were 0 housing units targeted.	There were 0 housing units made available as a result of this activity.	Yes

3. No benchmarks were set for FY2015. It was used as a planning year.
4. There were no revised metrics or benchmarks.
5. There is no change to the data collection process.



### Local Non-Traditional Initiatives

1. **2011 – 2 Convert Units to Public Housing Approved and Implemented FY2011.**

2. CHA's non-profit subsidiary, Horizon Development Properties, Inc. acquired Hampton Creste Apartments to add 60 public housing units to serve homeless families at Hampton Creste Apartments. The apartments have been refinanced and rehabilitated into a mixed-income community. The remaining 153 units are comprised of 40 at 40% AMI and 113 at 80% AMI. The activity was branded the Supportive Housing Innovative Partnership (SHIP).

The Salvation Army (TSA) is responsible for providing the supportive services. The SHIP program provides services to homeless families with children, such as intensive home-based case management and evidence-based programs and services that address severe emotional, social, developmental, educational, and employment challenges that homeless families may face entering permanent housing are provided.

The activity is on schedule and considered effective. During the months of April 1, 2014-March 31, 2015, 50% of SHIP residents remained employed full time or gained full time employment. Employment status fluctuated for residents as some would enter into the program with part-time employment and increase to full time, or residents would enter into the program with Work First income and increase their income prior to transitioning into housing.

Barriers to full time employment include:

- Access to reliable transportation
- Access to affordable and flexible childcare

During FY2015 fifteen (15) residents transitioned into unsubsidized housing. These residents utilized their social workers as valuable resources to transition into permanent unsubsidized housing by actively participating in their service plan, and other Program requirements. Residents who moved into unsubsidized housing maintained or gained sufficient full time employment while in the SHIP program, and saved money to pay for application fees, security deposits, and first month's rent.

Lack of adequate income has been a barrier to obtaining unsubsidized housing for SHIP program participants. Many have employment, but do not meet the income criteria for Market Rate housing, and thus have to apply to housing that is income based, or participate in housing programs within to the community, such as Rapid Rehousing that will provide a short to medium term subsidy.

Metric	Baseline	FY2015 Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<b>CE:4: Increase in Resources Leveraged</b>				
Increase of funds leveraged in dollars	Amount leveraged prior to implementation of the activity is \$0	Expected amount leveraged after implementation of the activity is \$160,000 annually	Actual amount leveraged is \$160,000	Yes
<b>SS#1: Increase In Household Income</b>				
Increase in average earned income of households affected by this policy in dollars.	Average earned income of households affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity is \$5,331 (28 families)	Expected average earned income of households affected by this policy after implementation of the activity is \$3,629 (57)	Actual average earned income for 51 households is \$3,120	No

		families)		
<b>SS#3: Increase in Positive Outcomes in Employment Status</b>				
Employed Full-Time	Head of households employed full-time prior to implementation of the activity is 15	Expected head of households employed full-time after implementation of the activity 19	Actual number employed full-time was 25	Exceeded
<b>SS#4: Households Removed from TANF</b>				
Decrease number of households receiving TANF assistance	Households receiving TANF prior to implementation of the activity is 12	Expected number of households receiving TANF after implementation of the activity is 24	Actual number of families receiving TANF is 27	No
<b>SS#5: Households assisted by Services that Increase Self Sufficiency</b>				
Increase in the number of households receiving services aimed to increase self sufficiency	There were 0 housing units of this type prior to implementation of this activity.	CHA expects 60 housing units of this type after implementation of the activity.	Actual units available are 60. Actual leased was 51	No
<b>SS#6: Reducing Per Unit Subsidy Costs for Participating Households</b>				
Decrease in average amount of Section 9 subsidy per household affected by this policy in dollars	Average subsidy per household affected by this policy prior to implementation of the activity is \$0	Expected average subsidy per household affected by this policy after implementation of the activity is \$360	Actual average PEL is FY366	No
<b>SS#7: Increase in Agency Rental Revenue</b>				
Increase in rental revenue in dollars	CHA had public housing rental revenue of \$4,780,996	CHA anticipates public housing rental revenue of \$3,723,776 for FY2015	Actual public housing rental revenue is \$3,872,072	Exceeded
<b>SS#8: Households Transitioned to Self Sufficiency</b>				
Increase in the number of households transitioned to self-sufficiency. (housing with no subsidy)	There were 0 households transitioned to self-sufficiency prior to this activity.	CHA anticipates 2 households to transition to housing with no subsidy.	Actual households transition to non subsidized housing is 15	Exceeded



HC#5: Increase in Resident Mobility				
Increase in number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity.	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity is 0.	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity is 60	Actual number of households moving to better unit/and or neighborhood was 51	No

3. The lower earned income average is not of great concern because the program transitioned 15 households to unsubsidized housing. Participants are encouraged to obtain needed stabilization assistance which includes TANF. The Project Expense Level (PEL) is an estimate of the cost to operate each project, exclusive of taxes, utilities and certain add-ons. CHA's subsidy assistance at a property has multiple variables outside of tenant rent that will influence the PEL. The households are transitional families through the Salvation Army therefore participation fluctuates.
4. No metrics or benchmarks were revised.
5. There was no change to data collection method.



1. **2011 - 3 New Construction of Affordable Units - Approved FY2010 and Implemented FY2011 (expanded FY2012)**
2. CHA proposes to develop properties into mixed-income communities. The projects will include units intended for a wide range of income levels, from market rate to units that are affordable to those earning less than 30% area median income (AMI). Adding these units will increase housing choices for those needing affordable housing. The selected environment will be an ideal situation for residents to excel in CHA's Moving Forward program.

There are currently two projects under this activity:

- The Vistas @ 707 (formerly named Lofts at Seigle Point) is the final on-site component of the Seigle Point HOPE VI redevelopment of the former Piedmont Courts. However, HOPE VI funding is not included in this project. CHA broke ground on the development in December 2012. The project is 91% completed as of March 2015. Project is off schedule due to weather and local code issues. The project will include 190 units of which 80% will be for lease to families at 80% AMI and below and 20% will be affordable to those at 50% AMI.

The overall Seigle Point community has a 10,000 square foot community building, 204 credit apartments, 31 market rate townhomes, and an amenity area with a playground, tennis & basketball courts, greenway, and shelter area.

- The second phase of The Residences at Renaissance is completed. An additional 74 units of rental housing for families was leased in FY2015. The third phase is 15% underway and will provide an additional 150 units at completion. The residential buildings proposed include three story apartment buildings, two story direct access apartment buildings and two story townhomes, configured in one- to three-bedroom units. The activity is on schedule and effective.

Metric	Baseline	FY2015 Benchmark	Outcome	Benchmark Achieved?
<b>HC#1: Additional Units of Housing Made Available</b>				
Increase in number of new housing units made available for households at or below 80% AMI as a result of the activity.	There were 0 housing units of this type prior to implementation of this activity.	There are 175 (152 Lofts, 23 Residences) units planned for FY2015.	There are 74 new housing units for households at or below 80% AMI	No
<b>HC#5: Increase in Resident Mobility</b>				
Increase in number of households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity as a result of the activity	Households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity prior to implementation of the activity is 0.	Expected households able to move to a better unit and/or neighborhood of opportunity after implementation of the activity is 175	There are 74 new households moved to a better unit and/or neighborhood	No

3. Construction at Vistas @ 707 (formerly the Lofts) is not complete and leasing has not begun.
4. The benchmarks or metrics were not revised.
5. There was no change to the data collection method.

## NOT YET IMPLEMENTED ACTIVITIES

None - There were 2 new activities approved in the FY2016 Moving Forward Annual Plan that were implemented after FY2015 concluded and will be reported on in the FY2016 Annual Report.

## ACTIVITIES ON HOLD

### *2009 - 6 Youth Initiatives*

1. In FY2009, CHA was approved to establish a Cooperative Agreement to Form Partnerships with Communities In School (CIS), Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools (CMS), Partners in Out of School Time (POST), and the Charlotte Housing Authority Scholarship Fund (CHASF) in order to connect CHA participants to programs and services that address truancy, post-secondary education preparation, and academic performance improvement. The Agreement has expired; however, CHA's focus continues to be on providing services for youth that are assisted by CHA housing programs as a means to help break the cycle of generational poverty. The authority will be seeking other partners and initiatives which can provide outcomes for the desired metrics for CHA's student portfolio. CIS's data was reporting aggregate data and did not allow CHA to see the progress of its student population.
2. CHA will use FY2015 as a planning year to identify new collaborations for serving the youth residing within our portfolio.

### *2009-1 Acquisition of General Partnership Interest*

1. *Acquire the General Partnership interest in the Little Rock Apartments* - This activity was approved in March 2010, but was made as a first amendment to the FY2011 plan. In June, 2011, CHA, acting through its subsidiary Horizon Acquisition Corp. (Horizon), acquired the general partnership interest in Little Rock Apartments, a 240-unit Section 8 multi-family project adjacent to the Boulevard Homes site (now known as The Renaissance).
2. Due to budget restraints, CHA's endeavor to provide services and opportunities to Little Rock's residents such as self-sufficiency and employment services is delayed. Once a plan for services has been approved, appropriate baselines, benchmarks, and measures will be developed and implemented.

## CLOSED OUT ACTIVITIES

### *Good Neighbor Training*

1. CHA proposed the Good Neighbor Training (GNT) activity in FY2008. The activity implementation began in FY2008 for HCV households and 2011 for Public Housing households. The training is designed to assist families' acclimation to a neighborhood. Participants learn more about being "Good Neighbors" by focusing on topics such as building codes and standards, property maintenance, basic zoning regulations, home maintenance, neighborhood involvement, school and amenities locations, and conflict resolution.
2. CHA continues to provide mandated GNT, which is conducted by CHA staff, to all new Housing Choice Voucher and public housing applicants entering the program. Good Neighbor Training for public housing and Housing Choice Voucher existing program participants has been completed. Port-Ins are also required to complete Good Neighbor Training.
3. This activity was closed out effective December 2014. CHA no longer requires the waiver to hold GNT since it has been incorporated into the briefing and all existing participants have been trained.

### *Biennial Review Process for Elderly and Disabled*

1. A biennial review process for elderly and disabled heads of households was approved by HUD for FY2009. Implementation of the Biennial Review Process began December 2010.
2. The activity is being closed out because the agency has implemented an agency wide Biennial Process. The elderly and disabled will be reported on as part of the entire agency report on skipped/conducted.
3. The activity was closed out FYE 2013.

### *Site-Based Waiting Lists for Public Housing and Project-Based Housing Choice Voucher*

1. CHA was approved to implement the site-based waiting lists for public housing and Project-Based Housing Choice Voucher units in FY2009. The activity began in the same year.
2. CHA continues to manage the waiting lists for public housing and project-based voucher units at the site level. CHA considers this activity a success due to no 3<sup>rd</sup> offers in FY2013.
3. This activity was closed out effective FYE 2013.

## Sources and Uses of MTW Funds

### Annual MTW Report

#### V.3.Report.Sources and Uses of MTW Funds

##### A. MTW Report: Sources and Uses of MTW Funds

###### Actual Sources and Uses of MTW Funding for the Fiscal Year

PHAs shall submit their unaudited and audited information in the prescribed FDS format through the Financial Assessment System - PHA (FASPHA), or its successor system

###### Describe the Activities that Used Only MTW Single Fund Flexibility

**With Every Heartbeat Is Life** - As of today's date the With Every Heartbeat is Life class is working on completing their 17th class session. We are hosting both a morning and an evening class and have over 23 participants coming from family and senior sites. In May of 2015, WEHL brought on 4 new Community Health Workers. Each worker is passionate and foresees bringing unique and factual information to the program.

In addition to educating our residents, the With Every heartbeat is Life program will be traveling to Washington DC to present our data/outcome and program operation to HUD, as part of our job plus grant. We will continue to educate our communities on heart healthy meals, the importance of physical activity and make participants knowledgeable of cardiovascular disease and its signs and symptoms.

**Resident Safety Activities** - The Resident Safety Department is comprised of two components, the investigative incidents for Public Housing communities and incidents for the Housing Choice Voucher Program. The Resident Safety Department is charged with the challenge of enhancing the quality of life for our residents and surrounding communities through crime prevention and deterrent initiatives. These initiatives focus on the safety and protection of our consumers and assets. The department is also charged with ensuring that

all participants of the HCV program adhere to the HUD policies, CHA procedures and all applicable laws. The major focal point is on the capturing, resolving and deterring program violations and fraud.

The 4th Quarter Part 1 Crime Stats for Charlotte Housing Authority communities resulted into a (36% increase) in comparison to the same time frame for over a three year average. The Third-Party communities had a (0%) in Part 1 Crimes. Analyzing and monitoring Part 1 Crime Statistics give us the ability to gain a snap shot of the pulse of the communities.

**CHA Managed Sites: Overall Fiscal Year (-4% reduction)**

- Aggravated Assaults continue to stand out as the category with the most incidents under violent-related crimes.
- Larceny Theft is the crime category that stands out the most for property-related crimes.

**Third-Party Managed Sites: Overall Fiscal Year (-6% reduction)**

- Aggravated Assaults continue to stand out as the category with the most incidents under violent-related crimes.
- Larceny Theft is the crime category that stands out the most for property-related crimes.

**Center for Employment Services (CES)** - 2. During the time period of April 2014 – March 2015, Center for Employment Services (CES) has placed 133 CHA residents in jobs. In FY14-15, the CES continued to extend services to communities along Charlotte's West Boulevard corridor. The agencies at the CES perform outreach and recruitment at all CHA properties; however, the emphasis continues to be communities that do not receive structured supportive services.

The following are the current measurements that are tracked by CES:  
§ Percentage of CHA residents who utilize CES structured programs: The performance metrics for this area was to have a 4% increase or more, with a target goal of a 50% participation rate. There was improvement in this area; however, a 44% participation rate (116 of 262 participants) was achieved. CHA will continue to work with resident organizations and case management staff to increase this number.

§ Percentage of CHA residents who utilize the CES to gain employment: A target goal of 50% job placement for CHA residents was established for this year. The center was able to achieve a 45% job placement rate (133 of 293). Efforts to assist residents become more marketable in occupations in demand will continue with increased numbers of skills training engagement with local skills providers.

§ Number of residents that become job ready through CES services. The target goal for this area was 50. The program was able to exceed this goal with 59 residents successfully completing job readiness training programs at CES.

Through the centers four (4) service providers, CES will continue to provide job training, job placement and GED training. Efforts to increase the activity level of CHA residents will remain a priority going into the next program year.

#### V.4.Report.Local Asset Management Plan

##### B. MTW Report: Local Asset Management Plan

Has the PHA allocated costs within statute during the plan year?

Yes

Has the PHA implemented a local asset management plan (LAMP)?

No

If the PHA is implementing a LAMP, it shall be described in an appendix every year beginning with the year it is proposed and approved. It shall explain the deviations from existing HUD requirements and should be updated if any changes are made to the LAMP.

Has the PHA provided a LAMP in the appendix?

No

In the body of the Report, PHAs should provide a narrative updating the progress of implementing and operating the Local Asset Management Plan during the fiscal year.

#### V.5.Report.Unspent MTW Funds

##### C. MTW Report: Commitment of Unspent Funds

In the table below, provide planned commitments or obligations of unspent MTW funds at the end of the PHA's fiscal year.

Account	Planned Expenditure	Obligated Funds	Committed Funds
Real	Strawn Master Plan	0	1640455

Estate			
Real Estate	Renaissance Child Development Center	0	6600000
Real Estate	J.T. Crawford Renaissance Community Center	0	1939149
Real Estate	Tall Oaks Predevelopment	0	514220
Real Estate	Park & Marsh Predevelopment	0	220244
Real Estate	Vistas @707	0	918184
Real Estate	Hall House Predevelopment	0	129709
Real Estate	Savannah Woods	0	1997806
AMPS	Edwin Towers	1	324867
AMPS	Leafcrest	2	78011
AMPS	Meadow Oaks	0	800649
AMPS	Claremont	0	387103
AMPS	Victoria Square	0	878941
AMPS	Southside-Aurora	0	450000
<b>Total Obligated or Committed Funds:</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>16879338</b>

In the body of the Report, PHAs shall provide, in as much detail as possible, an explanation of plans for future uses of unspent funds, including what funds have been obligated or committed to specific projects.

**Note:** Written notice of a definition of MTW reserves will be forthcoming. Until HUD issues a methodology for defining reserves, including a definition of obligations and commitments, MTW agencies are not required to complete this section.



## Administrative

- A. There are no HUD reviews, audits or physical inspection issues that require the agency to take action to address the issue.
- B. Most current evaluation results of the demonstration program:

The Center for Urban and Regional Studies at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (CURS) has evaluated the Charlotte Housing Authority's (CHA) Moving Forward program over the past five years. The evaluation objectives are to monitor and provide feedback on program implementation and assess Moving Forward outputs and impacts. The key research questions include:

- What are the major obstacles to implementing Moving Forward initiatives, and how are they overcome?
- To what extent has the Moving Forward program (i) achieved greater cost efficiencies; (ii) increased housing choices; (iii) assisted residents in achieving self-sufficiency; and (iv) improved residents' quality of life?
- What are the impacts of the Moving Forward program on CHA operations?

These research questions are being addressed through: (i) analysis of data from CHA's Yardi database; (ii) surveys of CHA residents; (iii) interviews with CHA and partner organization staff and board members, residents of the five work requirement sites, and those who have left CHA housing; and (iv) investigation of secondary data such as the Charlotte Quality of Life database.

In the past year, CURS has accomplished a number of activities in our evaluation. We published *Housing Choice Voucher Survey of Satisfaction and Needs* that reported findings from a survey of 641 randomly-selected CHA voucher holders and offered recommendations for future programming. We found that voucher holders are highly satisfied with both their housing and CHA policies; for instance, over 80% are 'very' or 'somewhat satisfied' with how the CHA enforces its rules. However, many respondents struggle with health issues, with 48% meeting criteria for possible depression. Dr. Rohe presented findings from this report to the CHA board in April 2015.

In January 2015, we released *Innovation in Public Housing: the Moving to Work Demonstration* and distributed copies to all 39 MTW agencies as well as HUD and relevant Congressional staffers. The report is the first to catalog activities undertaken across all MTW agencies along the demonstration's three statutory goals. It finds that several MTW activities have proven especially popular – including reducing the frequency of income recertifications and sponsor-basing vouchers – and suggests these as possible topics for national evaluation. Dr. Webb presented findings of this report to the CHA board in April 2015.

Building on this report, CURS has conducted additional research on MTW agencies with either work requirement or minimum earned income policies. CURS researchers contacted staff at nine of the ten agencies with such policies, and compiled data on implementation, supports offered to residents, and impacts associated with enforcement. Staff indicate that these policies have been effective in increasing both work efforts and rent revenues and that they have not resulted in greater eviction rates, likely due to supports provided to residents and liberal hardship policies. Ms. Frescoln reported findings from these interview at the 2015 National Moving to Work Conference.

In early 2015, CURS developed and administered a survey of residents in the CHA's family conventional public housing developments. This was our third survey of this population, and it included questions on household composition, satisfaction with housing and CHA policies, work efforts, resident health and child well-being, and financial security. Of 971 residents contacted, 452 completed the survey for a response rate of 53%. Survey responses inform much of our next Moving Forward report, to be released in fall 2015.

CURS has continued to collect and compile primary and secondary data, including semi-annual interviews with residents of the five work requirement developments and ongoing phone interviews with those who have left CHA housing. We also continue to analyze monthly reports submitted by case managers at the work requirement sites.

In the coming year, CURS will build on previous research and initiate several new activities, including:

- Releasing our second interim Moving Forward report, which draws on review program implementation and offer recommendations to improve performance.
- Publishing a report that offers best practices for work requirement implementation based on our research of other MTW agencies with such policies.
- Projecting the impact of CHA's biennial recertification policy through analysis of past years' MTCS records.
- Producing a report that compiles findings from surveys of those who have left CHA housing.

## Appendices Listing

Appendix A	Certification Statement
Appendix B	Listing of Developments with Public Housing and Project-Based Units
Appendix C	Rent Reform Impact Analysis for Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher Programs
Appendix D	Community Based Rental Assistance Policy
Appendix E	Hardship Policy
Appendix F	Work Requirement Policy
Appendix G	Rent Reform Overview
Appendix H	Sample Bedroom Rent Bands
Appendix I	Community Service Policy
Appendix J	Violence Against Women Act
Appendix K	Other Agency Activity
Appendix L	Ongoing Initiatives Summary
Appendix M	Homeownership Program Hardship Policy
Appendix N	Statement of Family Obligations for Homeownership Program